

FREEHOLDERS.

Maulde Aldwich.	Ranulf at Grove.	William Mossach.
John the Bell.	Gervase in the Hale.	Stephen Nicoll.
Elin Bleckenham.	James in the Hale.	Alice Page.
John Bonion.	Raulfe in the Hale.	Henry Page.
Raulfe Botilde.	John at Hedge. ¹	William Page.
Henry of Boydon.	Maulde Herbager.	Richard Phillips.
Henry of Bydik.	Richard Herbager.	John of Preston.
John Cardell.	Henry Jacob.	Jeffrey the Renter.
Saiger the Carpenter.	John Jacob. ¹	William Robert.
Richard of Colebrooke.	Walter the Kent.	Master of St. James's.
John the Dryver ¹	Sir John of Langton.	Prior of St. John's.
Richard of Easton.	John Leiard.	Sir Henry Scopre.
Isabella Elie.	William the Marshall.	John the Shepherd.
Walter Faber.	John of Middleton.	John Tripledon.
Roger Gerarde.	Robert the Morager.	Thomas Warin.
John the Goldbeater.	John of Morden.	_____ (51).
Walter Godwin.	Walter of Morden.	
William Goodwin.	Raulfe Mossach.	..le Sporier.

¹ Also Customary Tenants.

CUSTOMARY TENANTS.

John of Berefeyld.	Thomas Goodwin.	Richard Rolfe.
Walter Bernard.	Hugh at Hedge.	Raulfe Sagrym.
John the Bounde.	John at Hedge.	Richard Sagrym.
Juliana Bretts.	Maulde at Heretrowe.	Richard Sandre.
Richard the Brett.	Thomas Hewe.	Walter the Small.
Walter the Brett.	Roger Hutcheon.	Alexander the Smyth.
Alice Burdens.	William Hutchene.	Alane the Sopere.
Stephen the Carpenter.	John Jacob.	John Sweetson.
John the Carter.	Robert the Longe.	Richard Symond.
William the Carter.	John the Lyndraper.	Richard Tadbourne.
John the Cowpere.	Adam Martyn.	John the Waferer.
Richard Chalkhill.	Richard Martyn.	William the Thwite.
Thomas Daw.	John Mosthwite.	John Walker.
Sarah Dell.	John Nell.	John at Wood.
John the Dryver.	William Nell.	William at Wood.
John Dye.	Allan Norreys.	William the Woodward.
Thomas Edwrick.	William Oswald.	Richard of Wulfhurst.
John Eynolh.	John Page.	and
Hugh of Fryth.	Edward at Pirie.	Richard Blackett. ²
John Gerard.	Godwine at Pirie.	Richard le Child. ²
John the Godere.	Richard at Pirie.	_____ (75).
Walter Godfrey.	Sara at Pirie.	
Thomas Godhewe.	Walter at Pirie.	
Richard Godwyne.	William at Pirie.	Robert Sagrym.
John Goodhewe.	Richard Riche.	— Brent.
John Goodhewe	Richard Richer.	Gerys Ruddings.
the Younger.	John Roger.	
John Goodwin.	Richard Roger.	

² See Introduction, pp. 566-7.

MUSWELL FARM; OR CLERKENWELL DETACHED.

BY

F. W. M. DRAPER,

M.A. (CANTAB.), PH.D., LICENCIÉ ÈS LETTRES.

MUSWELL HILL was a famous place from the days of the early Plantagenets until the times of the Tudors. It owed its fame to the well from which it takes its title, though to-day the very site of it is almost forgotten.

The Mus Well was situated in the estate known until recently as Clerkenwell Detached, and formerly as Muswell Farm. This property, of 64 acres, lay along Colney Hatch Lane, stretching practically from the top of Duke's Avenue, as far as the western end of Goodwyn's Vale and, in a curve, from the eastern end of Goodwyn's Vale at Wetherill Road to a point on the railway roughly opposite to Rosebery Road. This sweeping boundary, the south-western arc, as it were, of a great circle, was closely bordered by the vast Tottenham Wood forming the northern boundary of the rest of Hornsey Parish and covering the Palace grounds right into (Tottenham) Wood Green.

The well itself was situated in what is now the front garden of a house in Muswell Road, called Monkswell, nearly opposite the top of Coniston Road, not much more than 100 yards above the Clerkenwell boundary and the edge of Tottenham Wood.

Clerkenwell Detached formerly belonged to the Benedictine nuns of St. Mary, Clerkenwell, whose priory was dissolved by Henry VIII.

With reference to the foundation of this priory the reader will find much to interest him in the pages of

Stow, Weever and Newcourt. The date of origin usually accepted, 1112, has been questioned by J. H. Round,¹ who prefers 1144. The discussion is not strictly connected with the subject of this essay, and I will not enter into it.

About the time of the foundation of Clerkenwell Priory, two men of identical name, uncle and nephew, became in succession Bishop of London. Richard de Belmeis the elder² was consecrated in 1108, and died in January, 1127-8. Richard de Belmeis the younger² became bishop in 1152, and died in 1162. Muswell Hill is situated in Hornsey, manor of the Bishops of London. One of the two de Belmeis gave to Clerkenwell Priory the parcel of land at Muswell now occupying our attention. It contained the Mus Well and it lay close to one of the main roads from London to the North. Messrs. W. McB. and F. Marcham consider³ it to have been waste of the manor, and it was almost certainly under forest. The tenants of the nuns no doubt cleared the wood in course of time and a dairy farm was established.

The following quotation shows by what course of events Muswell Farm came into prominence. It is taken from Norden's *Speculum Britanniae* (Mirror of Britain, 1593). "At Muswell Hill, called also Pinsenall Hill, there was a Chapel sometime bearing the name of 'Our Lady of Muswell,' where now Alderman Rowe hath erected a proper house. The place taketh the name of the well and the hill, Mousewell Hill, for there is on the hill a spring of fair water, which is now within the compas of the house. There was sometime an image of the ladie of Muswell, whereunto was a continual resort in the way of pilgrimage, growing, as is (though as I take it) fabulouslie reported, in regard of a great cure which was performed by this water upon a King of Scots, who being strangely diseased, was by some devine intelligence advised to take the water of a well in England called Muswell, which after long scrutation

and inquisition, this well was found, and performed the cure. Absolutely to denie the cure I dare not, for that the high God hath given vertue unto water to heale infirmities, as may appeere by the cure of Naaman the leper, by washing himself seaven times in Jordan, and by the poole Bethesda, which healed the next that stepped thereinto after the water was moved by the angell."

The interesting feature of this story is that the charters of Clerkenwell Priory establish connection with a King of Scots. Robert, son of Sewin of Northampton, gave⁴ the nuns of St. Mary 140 acres of land in Tottenham and the possessions granted to him by Malcolm, King of Scots. Not only the charter of Robert, son of Sewin, is included in the cartulary of the priory, but also the charter in which Malcolm made his grant to Robert. The cure of this Scottish King was obviously a matter of old tradition even in 1593, for Norden does not know the king's name.

I suggest that the King of Scots who made the grant to Robert of Northampton was identical with the visitor to Muswell, and that he was Malcolm IV. This king ruled from 1153 to 1165, that is during the reign of our Henry II, who confirmed the existing charters to the priory. We learn from Scott's *Tales of a Grandfather*⁵ that Malcolm was greatly attached to Henry, went with him to France, and sought his company to such an extent that his Scottish subjects threatened to revolt from their absentee monarch. A Scottish king who spent so much time in England would be more likely to seek a cure at an English medicinal well than one who stayed in Scotland. Moreover, Scott tells us, "he was so kind and gentle in his disposition, that he was usually called Malcolm the Maiden." May not this strange mildness in a turbulent age have been due to illness? The King was only twenty-four when he died. There is no great improbability in the supposition that Malcolm, in gratitude for a real or fancied cure, granted

the Tottenham lands to Robert of Northampton on condition that he left them to the priory in his turn.

The question of the meaning of "Muswell" is a contentious one, and I do not discuss it here.

Let us now consider the Muswell Farm as a spot made fashionable by the visit and reputed cure of a King of Scots. Whatever the facts of the cure, whoever the king was, and whatever the date of his visit, we may be sure that the story lost nothing in the telling. If any doubt existed whether the well was reponsible for the royal recovery, it was certainly given the benefit of the doubt by interested parties. What was in its favour was its geographical position. It would certainly have been easier of access if it had lain near one of the great waterways, but, failing that, and despite the badness of Colney Hatch Lane, that thoroughfare to the North was probably no worse than other roads of the day, and from it the well was but a hundred yards distant.

The offerings of the pilgrims of course found their way into the strong box of Clerkenwell Priory. But the pilgrimages were soon to cease.

We are now approaching the end of an age and the beginning of a new system. The capable dynasty of the Tudors is shaping a new England from the old. The religious establishments of this country which had grown up under the protection of the Church and had enjoyed several centuries of undisturbed development, as of unquestioned authority, are about to become involved in violent changes, of which Henry VIII's quarrel with the Pope is to be the occasion. Wealth and power are to change hands. The religious houses are to be the chief sufferers, the country gentlemen and the lawyers are to gain the most.

The immediate cause of this violent convulsion is the desire of Henry VIII to divorce Katharine of Aragon. Step by step Henry quarrels with the Pope, he attacks the ecclesiastical courts, he charges the clergy with treason, he makes himself Head of the English Church,

he assumes the right to collect certain church dues, the jurisdiction of the Pope is abolished. Then the King, advised by the very efficient Thomas Cromwell, begins in 1535 the inspection of the smaller monasteries which led to their dissolution in 1536, proceeds to attack the greater ones in 1537 and 1538, and works through his agents to such purpose that by 1540 not a monastery but has become secularised, has found its possessions confiscated by the Crown, and has had the mortification of seeing much of its wealth stick in transit in the palms of hundreds of grasping hands.

The first and obvious step in the spoliation of the monasteries was to make an inquiry what their wealth really amounted to. In 1535 a methodical inquisition into all ecclesiastical property in England was organised, known as *Valor Ecclesiasticus*. This was the first census of the kind since the *Taxatio Ecclesiastica* of Pope Nicholas IV in 1291, when the Pope granted the tenths to Edward I for six years to defray the expenses of a crusade. No such return had thus been made for some 250 years. In this inquiry the Priory of Clerkenwell was of course involved.

I do not give the full terms of the Latin text of the report. The substance of it is that the total income of the Priory of Clerkenwell was £227 18s. 5d., a large sum in Tudor times.⁶ Muswell is mentioned thrice. First, the dwelling-house, courtyard and gardens bring in a rent of 108s. 2d.; secondly, the value of the woods is reckoned at 10s. ("In Muswell x acr' precij acr' xijd"); thirdly, the tithes and offerings are worth 40s.

I have included the word "tithes" because the form of the Latin text gives me no option, but the tithes no doubt refer only to those received for the mother-church at Clerkenwell. The fame of Muswell had declined by Tudor times, but the visits of devout pilgrims still brought the prioress the considerable sum of forty shillings per annum. The total yearly value of Muswell to the priory was thus £7 18s. 2d.

In 1536 the Court of Augmentations was established to settle disputes about the property of suppressed religious houses, being so called because their dissolution augmented the revenues of the Crown. Then, having inspected the smaller houses to their undoing, the commissioners were sent forth by Cromwell to survey the great monasteries.

The course of events at Clerkenwell Priory was no doubt typical. We can imagine the rumour, that Clerkenwell was going to be treated like other establishments, reaching the priory, the excited canvassing of the situation by the nuns, the public calm and private anxiety of the lady prioress, and then the arrival of Cromwell's men and the peremptory demand for keys and seals.

In January, 1538, the prioress had been a little late in paying her annual dues.⁷ There is an entry in Cromwell's accounts: "Jan. 3rd. My lady of Clarconwell, 5 m." At the end of the year she was nearly a month early in payment. "Dec. 9th. Abbess of Clarconwell (whole year's fee), 5 m. due at Christmas next."

But the lady's determination not to incur odium by a seeming reluctance to pay her fees availed her nothing. In the following September the nunnery was broken up. A letter on the 6th of the month from the commissioner, Richard Layton, tells Cromwell how the affair has proceeded. "This Saturday, 6 Sept., we put the duke of Norfolk's servant in custody of Clerkenwell, and have fully dissolved it to the contentation of the prioress and her sisters."

Thus at last came the day when Clerkenwell Priory was secularised, many an unfortunate nun was cast out into a world whose ways she had forgotten, and no doubt many poor people at Clerkenwell, at Muswell Hill, at Tottenham and elsewhere were left thereby without the comfort both material and spiritual which the sisters had known how to give them.

But there is another side of the picture. We are accustomed to imagine that, with the diversion of all this ecclesiastical wealth into the royal coffers, the matter was ended as far as the Crown was concerned. This is not the case. Not only were the inmates of the religious houses paid a pension half-yearly, they were also given a lump sum in addition, usually equal to a quarter of the pension, to cover the period dating back from Michaelmas or Lady Day to the time when the institution was actually dissolved. On the 17th October, 1540, the record reads: "Pensions.—Clerkenwell, Midd. Isabel Sackefelde (i.e. Sackville), prioress, 50 l. Also Joan Edmondes, Eliz. Grygorye, Alice Walseye, Anne Borowe, Joan Hussey, Joan Mercer, Marion Smythe, Mary Overton, Thomasina Tufnall, Thomasina Burgoyn, and Joan Sakevylde, nuns." At the end of 1539 too there is an entry recording the payment of pension for the "last half year ended Michaelmas" to heads (and others) of a number of religious houses including "Clerkenwell nunnery."

Not only were these pensions (that of the prioress of Clerkenwell among them) paid immediately after the ejection of the inmates of the religious houses, they were also paid regularly at least down to the end of Henry's reign. This is a side to Henry's dissolution of the monasteries which has scarcely been remembered.

The first reference I find to the secularised property of Clerkenwell Priory at Muswell Hill appears among the life grants of lands and annuities for 1540. (Court of Augmentations.) The first few words are a little startling. "John Avery, late yeoman of the Bottles. A messuage (i.e. a dwelling-house with the land and buildings necessary for its use) called Muswell Farm, chapel called Muswell chapel, and the priest's chamber over the gate, in Clerkenwell parish,—which premises were leased to him by Isabel, late prioress of Clerkenwell."

It appears that Avery did not now become the owner of the property, but was merely the tenant.

There seem to have been several dwelling-houses on the estate, one being occupied by Avery and another by a man called Lodesman, of whom more anon.

The brothers Avery were protégés of Thomas Cromwell. Thomas Avery was Cromwell's personal servant, while John first appears as "groom" or "page for the mouth in the King's cellar." Very early in his career he seems to have been given, in addition to his other work, the superintendence of the accounts of certain estates in Wales. In April, 1524, he was granted an annuity of 10 marks "out of the issues of the lordship of Denbigh, North Wales." In November, 1526, he was appointed "Keeper of Denyulle park and woods in the lp. of Bromfelde, marches of Wales, with 2d. a day," and later in the year there is record of an annuity to him, among payments to officers in Wales. This no doubt refers to the 2d. a day. Nine years later, in February, 1535, "John Aveye, yeoman of the King's bottles," receives another Welsh appointment: "To be steward, surveyor and receiver of the lands late of Res Griffyth in the comwoode (commote or commot, i.e. administrative division) of Kidwelly, Karnollon and Iskennon, in the lordship of Kidwelly, S. Wales, parcel of the duchy of Lancaster, and governor of the manred (i.e. vassals) in the said comewood; with the appointment of officers under him." After another ten years, in a list giving (17th April, 1545) the total amount of fees paid to the auditors, chamberlains and receivers of the Court of General Surveyors, the name of John Aveye is found among the chamberlains and receivers. In the following year he died. "Grants in November, 1546.—Thomas Aveye, the King's servant. To be steward, surveyor, and receiver of the lands which came to the King by the attainder of Rice Griffith in the commotes or hundreds of Kydwelly and various places in co. Kaermarden; also ruler and leader of the tenants and

inhabitants of the said lands, and keeper of Denyulle Park, in the lordship of Bromefelde, co. Denbigh; vice John Averey, dec."

The other tenant of Muswell, Henry Lodesman, a former Serjeant of the Chaundry, is first made known to us as undertaking the "wardship of John, son and heir of Rob. Chamber." No doubt this was one of the quiet little jobs entrusted to Lodesman by Thomas Cromwell to which reference will shortly be made.

The lives of these two men, "Averay of the botelles" and Lodesman of the chaundry, were strangely linked. They were used a number of times by Cromwell, Henry VIII's unscrupulous secretary. No doubt they did as they were told, kept their mouths shut, and received their reward. On Cromwell's "Remembrances" (memoranda of things to be done) for 1534 there occurs: "Accounts. A remembrance for John Averey for a commission." Later in 1534 there is among the "Remembrances" a list of "bills in parchment to be signed" by Cromwell, and in it are the names "Hen. Lodisman and John Averye," not mentioned singly and independently like the other names in this long list, but joined by an "and" as if they were partners in some job.

In 1536 Cromwell used the pair again, this time as jurors in the trial of Anne Boleyn. On May 15th there is an "indictment found at Westminster (two pages long) on Wednesday next after three weeks of Easter 28 Henry VIII (May 10th) before Sir John Baldwin etc. by the oaths of (16 men including, linked together again by 'and,') Hen. Lodysman and John Averey; who present that whereas queen Anne has been the wife of Henry VIII for three years and more, she, despising her marriage . . . did falsely and traitorously . . ." (there follows a catalogue of horrible charges), which being considered proven, she was condemned to be beheaded or burned, as shall please the King, on the Green within the Tower.

In December, 1538, the kinsfolk of Cardinal Reginald

Pole, a descendant of George, Duke of Clarence, were sent by Henry to execution on a charge of treason. Henry Lodesman, without Avery this time, seems to have formed one of the jury in the trial. (*Baga de Secretis*, Pouch XI, Bundle 1).

In 1539 the pair were working together again. This time they were members of a grand jury empanelled for the trial of Sir Nicholas Carewe. In the following year Lodesman retired. His name is found among a list of pensioners from the royal household in 1540. This was the year of Cromwell's fall from favour and of his execution.

But no evil befell Avery and Lodesman. Their experience as members of packed juries was too valuable to lose. On 1st December, 1541, they were both members of the grand jury panel for the famous trial of Thos. Culpeper and Fras. Dereham accused of intrigues with Queen Katharine (Howard).

In 1544 we find Lodesman, for all the world as if he were a country gentleman, figuring among the number of those furnishing soldiers in Middlesex for Henry VIII's army in France.

Let us, after discussing the tenants, turn our attention to the owner of the Muswell Farm property, William Burnell of the Augmentation Office.

Henry VIII's cellar and kitchen seem to have been important kicking-off places for ambitious young men. We have seen Lodesman's and Avery's connection therewith. Burnell did not actually serve there, but presumably his brother did. A document to be signed by stamp, dated October 14th, 1546, in this case a lease, refers to "John Burnell of the cellar and William Burnell, Mr. Chancellor's servant." John Burnell's name is also to be found among the hundreds who ministered to the wants of the royal guests at Anne Boleyn's coronation.

William Burnell was the son of a London mercer, and was a clerk in the Court of Augmentations. We

should not expect to find Burnell's name recorded before 1536, when this court was set up, and actually the first notice of him occurs in 1539. In July, 1541, he is referred to as "one of Mr. North's clerks, a right honest person" and in 1546 as "Mr. Chancellor's servant." Edward North, father of the translator of Plutarch, was educated at St. Paul's School. He was Chancellor of the Augmentation, was knighted in 1541, and was afterwards raised to the peerage.

Much of the money derived from church lands seems to have been applied to the prosecution of Henry VIII's war with France. At any rate North paid the money out, from whatever source it was drawn, and nearly all the early references to William Burnell are connected with journeys across the Channel when, sometimes alone, sometimes in the company of one Edmund Martyn, he carried large sums of money, amounting to as much as £10,000, to Sir Edward Wotton, treasurer of Calais, Henry Palmer, treasurer of Guisnes, or Anthony Rowse, treasurer of works at Guisnes. These monies were for material used in the fortification of Calais and Guisnes and for the wages of "carpenters, horsemen, soldiers, and workmen" at both places. On one occasion he delivered 1,000 marks to the Lord Chamberlain, "500 marks to divers persons providing grain for Bulleigne, with 6 l. 13s. 4d. for himself."

In 1544 Burnell parted with Muswell Farm to another Augmentations man, William Cowper. *The Calendar of the Feet of Fines* for Henry VIII (Hilary, Anno 35) shows that "William Cowper and Cecilia his wife" bought from "William Burnell and Constance his wife a capital messuage called Muswell Farme, and land in the parish of Clerkenwell and Harnesey, and the site of a certain chapel, in the said parish, now dissolved, lately called Muswell Chapel."

Dugdale⁸ asserts that "in 1524 the messuage called Muswell Farm with the chapel of Muswell in parochia de Clerkenwell were held by William Cowper and

Cecily his wife." The date 1524 is obviously a mistake for 1544, for the reference given is 35 Hen. VIII, which is 1544.

On June 17th, 1546, the Augmentation records tell us that William Burnell was appointed bailiff and collector of the lands of Clerkenwell priory in Middlesex *vice* Thos. Cooke. We find his name again in a Patent Roll of Edward VI (Feb. 9th, 1553) as vendor of a pasture called Stonefeilde in "Messawell" (Muswell), mentioned several times in the Marchams' *Court Rolls of Hornsey*.

On the day after the announcement of Burnell's appointment as bailiff—18th June, 1545—licence to alienate "the great messuage or farm called Muswell Ferme and the chapel called Muswell Chapell in Clerkenwell parish, Midd. in tenure of Hen. Lodysman and John Averey" was granted⁹ to Wm. Cowper of Westminster, and Cecilia his wife. The purchaser, as we are told in detail in the Feet of Fines for Michaelmas, 1540, was Thomas Goldyng, son and heir of John Goldyng, esquire. In the words of Lysons¹⁰: "Muswell-farm house, with the site of the chapel and all quit-rents and other appurtenances, or, as it is called in other records, the manor of Muswell, was aliened in the year 1546 by William Cowper and his wife Cecily to Thomas Goldyng (Pat. 37 Hen. VIII. pt. 8. June 18)."

Before we pass to the next transaction in which Muswell Farm was involved, let us inquire into the identity of the Cowpers. It is a little confusing to pick one's way through the William Cowpers in Gairdner's volumes. The name, in its various spellings, seems to have been even more common than is Cooper to-day.

But in 1526 a William Cowper served as Clerk of the Summons in the office of the King's Remembrancer. This may have been our man.

Ten years later the Augmentation Office was established to deal with the affairs of the suppressed monasteries. This was a great and complex undertaking,

the staffing of which must have caused no small difficulty. The responsible officials were no doubt compelled to cast their nets wide to find efficient subordinates.

If Cowper was 28 or so in 1526 (perhaps he was more), he would be something like 40 years of age when on 4th November, 1538, he was appointed (if it was the same William Cowper) general surveyor of woods of suppressed monasteries in Wales. From now until 1546 his name constantly appears in the Augmentation accounts as that of a busy and trusted officer.

In March, 1539, William Cowper of Westminster and Cecilia his wife lay out £500 in the purchase of expropriated church property at Thurgarton in Notts.

Cowper is now travelling all over the country surveying property, usually lands confiscated from the Church. Many times he journeyed as one of the King's Commissioners in company with Nicholas Bacon, afterwards Sir Nicholas and father of Francis Bacon, as solicitor and Gregory Richardson or William Bolles as auditor. In this company he accepts the surrender of the collegiate church at Southwell with its property (1540), he surveys lands in Huntingdon (1542), and surveys the woods and examines the debts of Syon monastery (1543).

In so doing he is careful, like the other gentlemen of the Augmentations, to take all favourable opportunities of lining his own nest warmly. Thus in 1542 William Cowper and Cecily his wife buy property within the sanctuary of Westminster in St. Margaret's parish "within the close of the monastery" and formerly belonging to the Dean and Chapter, property which William had himself surveyed.

Then come two transactions with Sir John Williams, Treasurer of Augmentations, which are, in my opinion, good proof that William Cowper of Westminster who possessed at one time the Muswell estate is identical with William Cowper of the Augmentations. First (March, 1543) Sir John Williams alienates a Surrey

manor to William Cowper, son of William Cowper. Next (Feb. 1546) Ric. Andrewes of Hayles, Glouc. alienates much (confiscated) property including the manor of Combigga, co. Montgomery, to William Cowper. Finally "William Cowper of Westminster" alienates Combigga to Sir John Williams, Treasurer of Augmentations, in October 1546.

Who would be so likely to have continued dealings in confiscated land with the Treasurer of Augmentations as the Surveyor of Woods for the Augmentations, who acquired an estate from Burnell, a Clerk of the Augmentations?

No. To me it is clear that William Cowper "of Westminster," whose wife's name was Cecily, is the same person as he who surveyed woods for the Augmentation Office.

Let us pursue his fortunes a little further before his figure fades away again into obscurity.

In the spring of 1544 he seems to have had thoughts of retiring. But, about this time, commissions were appointed to survey the chantries all over the country. In February, 1546, Cowper was placed on the chantry commission for Notts and Derby, in both of which counties he owned former Church property. (It is a curious thing, which I mention because in 1546 Cowper disposed of Muswell Farm to *Thomas Goldynge*, but at the same time *John Goldyng* became a chantry commissioner for Essex, Herts. and Colchester.) By 28th September, Cowper may have completed his survey of the chantries, for there is record on that date of payment to him for the work.

With the next transfer of "Muswell Ferme" and "Muswell Chapell" we come to a name familiar to us all. It has been mentioned that the northern limit to Clerkenwell Detached was Goodwyn's Vale. On 21st August, 1549, Thomas Goldyng was granted licence for 30s. to grant his great messuage to John Goodwyn of London, marchant taillour, his heirs and assigns.¹¹

The premises remained in the Goodwyn family until 1577 when, we are told by Lysons, they were "aliened by Anne Goodwin and John Wighell to William Rowe and his heirs (Pat. 19 Eliz. pt. 3. Dec. 20)."

The transactions at this point again become obscure. The following note by Lysons¹² shows what probably happened:

"The manor of Muswell, etc., having been lately forfeited to the Crown by the attainder of William Goodwyn of Southwyke, in the county of Surrey, was granted to Sir Patrick Murray, in the year 1609. It is possible that this grant might have been made in consequence of some mistake in the return of Goodwyn's property, as Muswell farm had formerly belonged to that family. It is certain that it was granted by the Goodwyns to William Rowe in fee and that it was in the Rowe family in 1617, a few years after the grant to Murray. In 1591, there was an alienation from Rowe to Muffet, but this appears to have been a family conveyance. Sir William Rowe married into the Muffet family. His son, Sir Nicholas, who died in 1616, aged 48, and his grandson, Sir Nicholas, who was 13 years old at his father's death, are described as of Muswell Hill. The family of Rowe of Muswell Hill became extinct in the person of Anthony Rowe, Esq., who was buried at Hackney, anno 1704, and left some daughters, co-heirs, one of whom married an ancestor of the Marquis of Downshire."

It is a curious coincidence that the lines of fate of more than one crowned head should have crossed those of the history of Muswell Farm. We have seen that a legend of the cure of a Scottish King first brought fame to the place. It has further been indicated that two former servants of Henry VIII and tenants of the Muswell property were instrumental in the condemnation of two of that king's consorts.

But there is yet another royal—and tragic—connection. It has never been satisfactorily shown, as

far as I know, exactly how the regicide, Colonel Owen Rowe, was connected with the Muswell Hill family of that name. Lloyd tells us flatly¹³ that he was the father of Sir Thomas Rowe, the ambassador. I know not whence he draws his information. A writer in *Notes and Queries*, 25th June, 1859, signing himself the Bee, is of opinion that he was without doubt a member of the same family as Sir Thomas, the ambassador, and takes them to be first cousins. "At all events," he says, "the regicide colonel was descended from Sir Thomas Rowe," Lord Mayor of London in 1568.

The *Dictionary of National Biography* lays down without hesitation that he was the son of John Rowe of Bickley, Cheshire, yeoman, and was born about 1593. This is not the place to give a biography of him. But presumably he was a member of the Muswell Hill and Hackney family of Rowe for, after being condemned to death at the Restoration, he was reprieved, and imprisoned in the Tower, died there in 1661, and was buried in Hackney Church. That he was buried there seems final proof that he was a member of the family, for many of the Muswell Hill Roes or Rowes were buried at Hackney too.

Owen Rowe then sat in judgment on Charles I and condemned him to death.

The Rev. C. J. Robinson draws attention in *Notes and Queries*¹⁴ to the civic honours won by this remarkable family, which claimed three Lord Mayors of London. Sir Thomas Rowe was Lord Mayor in 1568 and married the sister of Sir Thomas Gresham. Sir William was Lord Mayor in 1592, the year before Norden writes of him as "Alderman Roe." The third was Sir Henry.

The most famous member of the family was Sir Thomas Rowe who, after spending some time at Queen Elizabeth's court and being knighted by James I, showed his high spirit by sailing 200 miles up the Amazon in his 28th year. Finally, in 1614, he represented

King James as ambassador at the court of the Great Mogul, Jehangir, Emperor of Hindustan.

Another Rowe, as famous in his day as Sir Thomas, was Nicholas, the playwright, author of *Tamerlane* (1702), *Jane Shore* and *Lady Jane Grey* (1715). Nicholas Rowe, born in Bedfordshire in 1673, was educated at a school at Highgate and at Westminster in the time of Busby who, says Dr. Johnson (tactfully) writing of Rowe in his *Lives of the Poets*, "suffered none of his scholars to let their powers lie useless."

Mary Rowe, eldest daughter and co-heir of Anthony, the last Rowe of Muswell Hill, was the widow of Sir Edmund Denton, Bart., when she married Trevor Hill (b. 1693), afterwards First Viscount Hillsborough. The latter died in 1742 (four months before his wife) and left an only son, Wills, born in 1718, who was created First Marquess of Downshire.

As to the ecclesiastical history of the Clerkenwell property at Muswell Hill, it appears that no claim by the parish of Hornsey was ever laid to it, because no tithes could be claimed from a religious house. When, therefore, the parish of St. James', Clerkenwell, took the place of St. Mary's Priory, the Muswell land was considered to form part of it. Once every seven years, parson and parish clerk, councillors and choir-boys visited the spot to beat the bounds and assert the rights of Clerkenwell. We learn from Pinks¹⁵ that, of the eight dwellings standing on the property about 1860, the two nearest Colney Hatch Lane were reputed to occupy the site of the nuns' dairy farm, and further that, as the nearest house to these two ran across the parish boundary, it was necessary for the Clerkenwell representatives mentioned above to pass through it in order to maintain their ancient parochial boundary. This statement is borne out by the Ordnance Survey map of the same period. "Muswell Hill," I quote from Kelly's Directory, "was with Fortis Green, constituted an ecclesiastical parish on the 6th October, 1843, from the civil parishes of Clerkenwell and Hornsey."

I will sum up in a few words the latter-day civil history of Muswell Farm—"chiefly pasture land" in 1860.

We glean from W. C. Oulton's *Travellers Guide*¹⁶ (1805) the fact that "the manor-house" of Muswell Hill "was converted to a place of public entertainment." This grandiloquent description but barely conceals the true state of affairs, revealed to us by the author of *A Description of the County of Middlesex*¹⁷ that in 1775 the house, after becoming the property of the Earl of Bath had been "lately converted into a public-house."

B. Lambert,¹⁸ compiling his *History and Survey of London and its Environs* in 1806, records that "the well still remains, but is not famed for any extraordinary virtues."

Pinks,¹⁹ writing 50 years later, concurs with this statement in the *History of Clerkenwell*. Thirty years later still, matters had grown even worse, for Lloyd,²⁰ in 1888, tells us that "the well still remains, but, alas for its virtues, they are drained dry! The water, diverted by building and road-making, has disappeared, which is probably a very good thing, as of late years it was certainly only polluted surface drainage."

In 1900, Clerkenwell Detached was placed under the jurisdiction of the Borough of Hornsey and the only landmarks to tell of a connection lasting for 800 years are the boundary-marks bearing the name of Clerkenwell such as we see just above Rosebery Road in Dukes Avenue, Muswell Hill, and just above St. Andrew's Church, in Alexandra Park Road.

NOTES.

1. *Archaeologia*, LVI, 1899, pp. 223-8.
2. G. Hennessy, *Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense* (1898), p. III.
3. *Court Rolls of the Bishop of London's Manor of Hornsey* (1929), p. XV.
4. Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (1846), IV, 83.
5. Scott, *Tales of a Grandfather*, chap. 4.
6. *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, 1810 edition, I, 395.

7. For the "Augmentations" period the authority is *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII*. Vols. I-IV were edited by J. S. Brewer, Vols. V-XXI by James Gairdner. The many references will be found in the indices there under name and date.
8. *Monasticon*, IV, 78, note h.
9. Gairdner, *Letters and Papers*.
10. *Environs of London*, by the Rev. Daniel Lysons (1795), III, 51.
11. Patent Rolls, 3 Edw. VI.
12. Lysons, *op. cit.*, III, 51, n. 26.
13. J. H. Lloyd, *History of Highgate* (1888), p. 288.
14. N. & Q., Vol. VII (second series), p. 477.
15. W. J. Pinks, *History of Clerkenwell* (written before 1860), p. 20.
16. W. C. Oulton, *Traveller's Guide*, II, 300.
17. *A Description of the County of Middlesex*, 1776, p. 173.
18. B. Lambert, *History and Survey of London and its Environs*, 1806, IV, 290.
19. Pinks, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
20. Lloyd, *op. cit.*, p. 287.